



GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
Intellectual Property Causes
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191

Attorney Docket No. P20962

In re application of: Toshio TAMURA et al.

Application No. : 09/807,965

Filed : April 26, 2001

For : SALES SUPPORT SYSTEM

Mail Stop Amendment
Group Art Unit: 3627

Examiner: A. Fischer

Mail Stop Amendment

Commissioner for Patents
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Sir:

Transmitted herewith is an **Election with Traverse** in the above-captioned application.

☐ Small Entity Status of this application under 37 C.F.R. 1.9 and 1.27 has been established by a previously filed statement.

☐ A verified statement to establish small entity status under 37 C.F.R. 1.9 and 1.27 is enclosed.

☐ A Request for Extension of Time.

☒ No additional fee is required.

The fee has been calculated as shown below:

Claims After Amendment	No. Claims Previously Paid For	Present Extra	Small Entity		Other Than A Small Entity	
			Rate	Fee	Rate	Fee
Total Claims: 68	68	0	x 9=	\$	x 18=	\$0.00
Indep. Claims: 11	11	0	x 44=	\$	x 88=	\$0.00
Multiple Dependent Claims Presented			+150=	\$	+300=	\$0.00
Extension Fees for ____ Month(s)				\$		\$0.00
Total:				\$	Total:	\$0.00

* If less than 20, write 20

** If less than 3, write 3

☐ Please charge my Deposit Account No. 19-0089 in the amount of \$_____.

☐ A check in the amount of \$_____ to cover the *filing/extension* fee is included.

☒ The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge payment of the following fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0089.

☒ Any additional filing fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16.

☒ Any patent application processing fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.17, including any required extension of time fees in any concurrent or future reply requiring a petition for extension of time for its timely submission (37 C.F.R. 1.136(a)(3)).

William E. Lyddane
Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027
Reg. No. 41,568



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Toshio TAMURA et al.

Examiner: A. FISCHER

Appln. No: 09/807,965

Group Art Unit: 3627

Filed: April 26, 2001

For: SALES SUPPORT SYSTEM

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT, WITH TRAVERSE

Commissioner for Patents
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Service Window, Mail Stop Amendment
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Sir:

ELECTION

In response to the Examiner's restriction requirement dated January 25, 2005, in which the one-month shortened statutory period for responding runs to February 25, 2005, applicants elect, with traverse, the invention identified by the Examiner as Group I, including claims 1 - 28 and 34 - 43.

TRAVERSE

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's restriction requirement.

Although the Examiner's Office Action appears to accurately identify three inventions, applicants respectfully request that each invention, nevertheless, be examined in the instant application, pursuant to the guidelines set forth in

M.P.E.P. §803. That is, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his requirement and find that there would not appear to be a "serious burden" on the Office in examining claims directed to the non-elected inventions, viz., claims 29 - 33, and 44 - 68, which would remain withdrawn from consideration if the restriction requirement is maintained.

M.P.E.P. Chapter 800, sets forth the policy by which Examiners are guided in requiring restriction under 35 U.S.C. §121. Section 803 states that "[i]f the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions."

Applicants respectfully submit that, in spite of the accuracy of the Examiner's restriction analysis, the subject matter of claims 1- 28 and 34 - 43 (e.g., Invention I) and the subject matter of claims 29 - 33 and 64 - 68 (e.g., Invention II) and the subject matter of claims 44 - 63 (e.g., Invention III) are inter-related. Further, it would appear that the search for the inventions identified by the Examiner would be coextensive or at least significantly overlap. That is, if the Examiner were to perform a search for the invention of Group I (claims 1 - 28 and 34 - 43), i.e., the sales support system, there would not appear to be a serious burden in continuing the examination of the inventions of Group II (claims 29 - 33 and 64 - 68), i.e., a visit support system, and Group III (claims 44 - 63), i.e., the quotation system.

Therefore, applicants respectfully request that the restriction requirement be reconsidered and withdrawn, in view of a lack of a serious burden, as recognized in M.P.E.P. §803 as being a prerequisite to a proper restriction requirement.

Any comments or questions concerning this application can be directed to the undersigned at the telephone number given below.

Respectfully submitted,
Toshio TAMURA, et al.

 William E. Lyddane
Reg. No. 41,568

Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

February 25, 2005
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191